

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 8, 2007. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 12 and 13 are in independent form. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 13 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0019671 (Metz).

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 12 and 13 in terms that more clearly define what he regards as his invention. Applicant submits that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a network device managing apparatus including: (1) a receiving unit adapted to receive a search request of network devices and identification information from a data processing apparatus; (2) a searching unit adapted to search network devices in response to the search request received by the receiving unit; (3) an obtaining unit adapted to obtain a past device list associated with the identification information received by the receiving unit, the past device list indicating a search result at the time when searched before the search by the searching unit; (4) a comparing unit adapted to compare the search result by the searching unit with the past device list obtained by said obtaining unit; (5) a forming unit adapted to specify from among the network devices searched by the searching unit the network device not presented in the past device list, and forming a device list in which the specified network device has been emphasized; and (6) a transmitting unit adapted to transmit the device list formed by

forming unit to the data processing apparatus.

Among other notable features of Claim 1 are: (1) an obtaining unit adapted to obtain a past device list associated with the identification information received by the receiving unit, the past device list indicating a search result at the time when searched before the search by the searching unit and (2) a comparing unit adapted to compare the search result by the searching unit with the past device list obtained by said obtaining unit.

Metz relates to a network managing device that periodically performs printer discovery, thus acquiring printer information such as an IP address and the like, and registers the printer information on a main list. Then, the printers registered on the main list are automatically distributed to a filtered second list according to criteria such as specific model types, locations, capabilities, and the like. Metz discusses that the network managing device performs the printer discovery and forms two kinds of lists, but does not disclose obtaining any past device list associated with received identification information and does not compare such a past device list and the discovered device with each other. Thus, Applicant has found nothing in Metz that would teach or suggest at least “obtaining unit adapted to obtain a past device list associated with the identification information received by said receiving unit, the past device list indicating a search result at the time when searched before the search by said searching unit” or “comparing unit adapted to compare the search result by said searching unit with the past device list obtained by said obtaining unit,” as recited in claim 1.

Further, since Metz fails to teach or suggest the obtaining unit adapted to obtain a past device list, it follows that it fails to teach or suggest “forming unit adapted to specify from among the network devices searched by said searching unit the network device not

presented in the past device list, and forming a device list in which the specified network device has been emphasized” and “transmitting unit adapted to transmit the device list formed by said forming unit to said data processing apparatus,” as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Metz.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant’s opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 1.

Independent Claims 6 and 12 are method and program claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable over Metz for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

Claim 2 is directed to a network device managing apparatus which includes: (1) a receiving unit adapted to receive a search request of network devices and identification information from a data processing apparatus; (2) a searching unit adapted to search network devices in response to the search request received by the receiving unit; (3) an obtaining unit adapted to obtain a past device list associated with the identification information received by the receiving unit, the past device list indicating a search result at the time when searched before the search by the searching unit; (3) a comparing unit adapted to compare the search result by the searching unit with the past device list obtained by the obtaining unit; (4) a forming unit adapted to specify from among the network devices searched by the searching unit the network device of which the state has been changed, and forming a device list in which the specified network device has been emphasized; and (5) a transmitting unit adapted to transmit the device list formed by the forming unit to the data processing apparatus.

For substantially the same reasons as discussed with respect to Claim 1, Applicant has found nothing in Metz that would teach or suggest “obtaining unit adapted to obtain a past device list associated with the identification information received by said receiving unit, the past device list indicating a search result at the time when searched before the search by said searching unit” or “comparing unit adapted to compare the search result by said searching unit with the past device list obtained by said obtaining unit,” as recited in Claim 2.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 2 is not anticipated by Metz.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant’s opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 2.

Independent Claims 9 and 13 are method and program claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 2, and are believed to be patentable over Metz for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 2.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Early and favorable continued examination of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 633026v1